



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,780	02/09/2004	Gregory D. Aviza	00216-674001 / Case 8144	8854

26161 7590 01/22/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

PETERSON, KENNETH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/774,780

Applicant(s)

AVIZA, GREGORY D.

Examiner

Kenneth E. Peterson

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22,28,29 and 31-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22,28,29 and 31-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3724

1. Applicant's new claims include two claims that are numbered "40". Accordingly, the second occurrence of claims 40 has been renumbered ~~41~~. Submitted claim 41 has been changed to ~~42~~.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 22,28,29,35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andrews '201, who shows several instances of a razor and cartridge with all of the recited limitations. See, for example, the embodiment of figure 10. This can have three blades as discussed on line 9 of column 13. Note the short walls on the front and back sides, which together with the lateral side walls, create a walled rectangle.

The housing has side surfaces (310,312) that constitute "guards" since they laterally protect the face from excess blade penetration.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews '201.

Andrew's razor has two or more razor blades, but does not explicitly discuss having four or five. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known for razors of this type to have up to five blades. Applicant has not challenged this point and it is now taken to be fact. An example of this is the patent publication to Coffin et al. '835 (line 1, page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Andrews by employing up to five blades, instead of just two, as is well known and taught by Coffin, in order to provide a smoother shave.

6. Claims 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews '201.

Andrew's razor blades appear to be held in slots, but this is not explicitly stated. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known for the opposed ends of razor blades to be attached in slots, and also to employ the hole-and-projection connection. Examples of slots are the patents to Brown, Jr. et al. '907 (figure 5), Welsch '893 (cover figure), Francis '321 (figure 1) and Anderson '316 (18,19). Francis and Anderson in particular show the hole-and-projection connection. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Andrews by attaching the razor blade ends by a slot with hole-and-projection connections, as is well known and taught by the above prior art, in order to firmly secure the blade. Applicant has not challenged this taking of Official Notice, and therefore it is now taken to be fact.

7. Claims 22,29,31,35,36,39,41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santhagans Van Eibergen '961, who shows in figure 3 a razor with most of the recited limitations including a housing having a guard (21,25), a rectangular recess, and a lubricating strip (23, lines 18-21, column 6). Santhagans Van Eibergen also shows a blade subassembly having three metal blades (5) secured in slots in blocks (9).

Santhagans Van Eibergen's blocks are of unknown material. Examiner takes Official Notice that in the art of razors, it has long been known to employ plastic for most of the pieces. For example, see claim 9 of Lembke et al.'467. Additional examples can be provided if needed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made Santhagans Van Eibergen's blocks out of plastic, as is standard in the art, in order to decrease costs and simplify the manufacturing process.

8. Claims 22,28,29,35,38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Francis '853, who shows in figure 10 a razor with most of the recited limitations including a housing having a guard (60) and a rectangular recess which holds a blade subassembly having two metal blades (40',42') secured to blocks (44').

Francis's blocks are of metal instead of plastic. Examiner takes Official Notice that in the art of razors, it has long been known to employ plastic for most of the pieces. For example, see claim 9 of Lembke et al.'467. Additional examples can be provided if needed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made

Art Unit: 3724

Francis's blocks out of plastic, as is standard in the art, in order to decrease costs and simplify the manufacturing process.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Made of record but not relied on is a patent to Gooding showing a blade subassembly.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth E. Peterson whose telephone number is 571-272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

kp



Ken Peterson